



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/069,106

06/04/2002

Tetsuo Yamaguchi

P21988

1743

7055 7590 02/18/2009
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

GOTTSCHALK, MARTIN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3696

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/18/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/069,106	Applicant(s) YAMAGUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner MARTIN A. GOTTSCHALK	Art Unit 3696	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. Claims 1-32 are pending. Claims 30-32 are amended and have been examined. Claims 1-29 have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. The rejections made in the last office action under this section are hereby withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koenig (US Pat# 7,167,855) in view of Anwar (US Pat# 6,750,864).

As per claims 30-32 (as represented by exemplary claim 30), Koenig teaches an information supply system (Koenig: col 4, lns 1-5) comprising

a server connected to a network and a terminal device (Koenig: Fig 1) which requests said server for information over said network (Koenig: abstract), wherein

said server transmits ranked information using numeric values of specified information and weightings for said specified information to said terminal device according to a request from said terminal device, said weightings being entered from said terminal device (Koenig: col 9, lns 60-66; Fig 10. The Examiner considers the priority to be a type of rank, and the desired skill level to be a type of weight; col 20, lns 17-49), said information supply system comprising:

means for displaying information having a highest score of said ranked information and other information of said ranked information on a results display area of a display unit of said terminal device (Koenig: col 10, lns 53-59), each of said displayed information being arranged (Koenig: col 8, lns 62-67; Fig 8, i.e. the use of graphic displays is taught wherein

centering is a well known design choice) about said information having the highest score (Koenig: col 21, lns 50-53; Fig 18, item 1816),

means for displaying a difference between scores of said information having the highest score and other information of said ranked information on the results display area of the display unit of said terminal device as a distance from a center of the results display area of the display unit of said terminal device, the center of the results display area being associated with the highest score (Koenig: col 21, lns 15-37, note the differences between provider and requestor levels are used in the formula, and these are subsequently displayed.)

and

means for dynamically displaying a change of centered information and changes in distances of said ranked information from the center of the results display area of the display unit of said terminal device in response to changes in said weightings transmitted from said terminal device (Koenig: col 10, lns 20-30; col 14, lns 12-26, i.e. updates provide changes that will be displayed as per the previous steps above; col 20, lns 57-65).

Koenig teaches graphic display of information as cited above, but fails to explicitly teach the data displayed in a concentric arrangement. However, this feature is taught by Anwar. Anwar teaches methods of displaying multi-dimensional data in different formats to improve visualization of large amounts of data (Anwar: col 1, Ins 21-24). One such method is known as a "Multidimensional Decision Tree Visualizer" or MDTV (Anwar: col 20, ln 35 to col 24, ln 60; Figs 8a, b, and 9-11). This method constructs decision trees with a parent root node as the center-most ring, and subsequent generations of child branches represented as concentric rings surrounding the parent (Anwar: col 20, Ins 38-44). Thus the data of Koenig could be adapted by the system of Anwar to produce the feature of

means for displaying information having a highest score of said ranked information and other information of said ranked information on a results display area of a display unit of said terminal device each of said displayed information being concentrically arranged about said information having the highest score,

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Koenig with the method of Anwar (e.g. the MDTV technique) with the motivation of displaying multi-dimensional data in a format that improves its visualization (Anwar: col 1, Ins 21-24).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 30-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied prior art teaches methods of concentric data representation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARTIN A. GOTTSCHALK whose telephone number is (571)272-7030. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Dixon can be reached on (571) 272-6803. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. A. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 3696

/Ella Colbert/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3696